stakeholder involvement and furthers the openness and transparency for which all Federal Government programs should strive.

I strongly encourage the passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us represents the efforts of several constituent organizations working with the administration and the Congress to reach consensus.

Among the organizations who worked to produce this proposal were the Natural Resources Defense Council, Crop Life America and the Consumer Specialty Products Association. I appreciate their hard work and their willingness to set aside past differences to develop a fair and balanced funding mechanism for the EPA pesticide registration program that satisfies the needs of government, industry and the environment.

As Chairman CARDOZA pointed out, this legislation renews the successful program established in 2004 to fund the pesticide registration program administered by the Environmental Protection Agency.

The original legislation had many successes including providing stable funding for the EPA, predictable timelines for industry, new products for consumers, and the necessary funding for the EPA to complete the tolerance reassessment process mandated by the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996. While the 2004 legislation doesn't expire until next year, the realities of Federal budgetary pressure and the resulting uncertainty regarding the adequacy of appropriations make immediate action on this reauthorization legislation critical.

S. 1983 reauthorizes the existing pesticide registration program with several enhancements aimed toward clarifying what is covered and which activities the fees can be used to support, while protecting funding for certain environmental grant programs.

Again, I want to commend the groups whose efforts were instrumental in producing this legislation. I also want to commend Chairman Peterson and Subcommittee Chairman Cardoza and urge all Members to join us in supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further Members who seek time on my side. I just wish to also thank my colleague from Virginia for his cooperation on working together with us to extend this program.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1983, the Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act, and encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

In 2003, with the collaboration of agriculture, pesticide manufacturers and public interest organizations, Congress established a new fee schedule and registration process timeline for the Environmental Protection Agency, This Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA) was designed to improve pesticide registration and review, and PRIA has been extremely successful for all parties involved.

As the Ranking Member of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Horticulture and Organic Agriculture, which has jurisdiction over pesticide issues, I am pleased the stakeholders have again worked with Congress and the EPA This bill today continues and builds upon the successful pesticide registration process over the next five years.

Before PRIA, applicants for pesticide registration had no certainty on how long the review process at EPA would take or how much they would need to pay in fees. The EPA was under pressure from the public interest community to reassess tolerances for pesticides already registered as required under the Food Quality Protection, Act. As a result, consumers who depend on effective and safe pesticide products were not always able to take advantage of new products. Delays impacted farmers' ability to access improved plant protection and pest products.

PRIA worked because it set a firm fee schedule for pesticide registration applicants, giving the EPA resources needed to do reviews. In return, the EPA was held to specific timelines in its reviews and approvals. PRIA also enabled the EPA to complete tolerance reassessments for products approved in the past through product maintenance fees from manufacturers.

By continuing the fees and increasing registration funding, S. 1983 provides the EPA with the resources needed to maintain this successful system. Additionally, the bill continues the periodic review of registered products, requiring the EPA to reassess each product every 15 years.

The pesticide registration and review process must be based on sound science. Success also requires confidence in the regulatory system. This reauthorization and enhancement of PRIA helps ensure that the EPA is using the best science to review applicants. Timelines for reviews bring more transparency to the process, and this transparency gives confidence to pesticide users such as agriculture, manufacturers and the public interest community.

I urge my colleagues to support continuation of this successful regulatory process that has brought effective and safe products to market not only for agriculture but for all consumers.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1983.

The question was taken; and (twothirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIRES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVER-SARY OF THE SEPTEMBER 25, 1957, DESEGREGATION OF LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL BY THE LITTLE ROCK NINE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 668) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the September 25, 1957, desegregation of Little Rock Central High School by the Little Rock Nine.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

## H. Res. 668

Whereas on May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court announced in Brown v. Board of Education (347 U.S. 483) that, "in the field of education, the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place";

Whereas the Brown decision recognized as a matter of law that the segregation of public schools deprived students of the equal protection of the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

Whereas in 1957, three years after the landmark Brown v. Board of Education decision, the promise of access and equality within the realm of education remained unfilled in Little Rock, Arkansas, and throughout the Nation;

Whereas on September 4, 1957, nine African American students who would later be deemed the Little Rock Nine, Minnipan Brown, Elizabeth Eckford, Ernest Green, Thelma Mothershed, Melba Pattillo, Gloria Ray, Terrence Roberts, Jefferson Thomas, and Carlotta Walls, were denied admittance to Little Rock Central High by the Arkansas National Guard at the order of the Arkansas Governor:

Whereas on September 23, 1957, the Little Rock Nine, armed with a Federal court order, again tried to attend Little Rock Central High and implement the law of the land, but protests and violence forced the group of students to leave the school;
Whereas on September 25, 1957, this Nation

Whereas on September 25, 1957, this Nation would realize a historic day when the Little Rock Nine, escorted by Federal troops at the order of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, successfully integrated Little Rock Central High:

Whereas throughout their tenure at Little Rock Central High, the Little Rock Nine, with conviction and dignity, championed school integration despite death threats, verbal and physical assaults, school closings, and other adversities;

Whereas the Little Rock Nine are symbolic of the victorious dismantling of school segregation, as well as the full and equal participation in American society that all citizens are entitled to, and continue to advance such principles through the Little Rock Nine Foundation: